

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS****1. Rejection of claims 12-13 and 16:**

Claims 12-13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Duijneveldt (U.S. Patent No. 5,971,567). Reasons of rejection are cited on page 2-3  
5 of above-mentioned Office Action.

**Response:**

Examiner notes that Van Duijneveldt discloses a backlight source disposed under a display panel in Fig. 4A. The backlight source has a plurality of parallel U-shaped lamps (34, 34', 35, 35'...). In the example shown in FIG. 4A and col. 7 lines 36-43, four power sources 38, 38', 39, 39' are used, with *two U-shaped lamps 34, 34' being connected in series to a first power source 38, two U-shaped lamps 35, 35' being connected in series to a second power source 39, two U-shaped lamps 34', 34" being connected in series to a third power source 38' and two U-shaped lamps 35', 35"" being connected in series to a fourth power source 39'*. Herein, Van Duijneveldt clearly describes that two U-shaped lamps 34, 34' being connected in series to a first power source 38, in col. 7, line 38. The conclusion of the above-mentioned Office action made by Examiner might be a misunderstanding. In short, *at least one end (electrode) of each of the U-shape lamps (34, 34', 35, 35') of Van Duijneveldt's invention is electrically connected to another end (electrode) of the neighboring U-shaped lamps in series.*

20 In response to Examiner's rejection, claim 12 is amended according to Fig. 4 of the present application. The currently amended claim 12 is repeated as follows.

Claim 12 (currently amended): A backlight source disposed under a display panel, the backlight source comprising a plurality of parallel U-shaped lamps, each of which comprises a bending portion, a high voltage electrode at one end and a low voltage electrode at another end of each of the U-shaped lamp, the U-shaped lamps being reverse disposed side by side along a first direction, each of the U-shaped lamps being bent in a

reverse direction to the adjacent U-shaped lamps, so that the high and low voltage electrodes are positioned in two lines along the first direction, and the high voltage electrode of each of the U-shaped lamps is adjacent to the low voltage electrode of the same U-shaped lamps;

5 wherein each of the U-shaped lamps has an opening defined by its two ends and bending portion, and one end of each of the U-shaped lamps is positioned inside the opening of one of the adjacent U-shaped lamps;

wherein the low voltage electrode of each U-shaped lamp is not connected to the high voltage electrode of any other U-shaped lamp in series.

10 As described in paragraph [0018] of the present application, the high voltage electrode 36a and the low voltage electrode 36b of each U-shaped lamp 36 are electrically connected to a respective connector 38, which is connected to the control circuit 37 and the power supply 39 for providing current to drive the U-shaped lamp 36. Therefore, the low voltage electrode of each U-shaped lamp is not connected to the high voltage electrode of any other U-shaped lamp in series. Any two of the U-shaped lamp of the present invention are not connected in series. Even if Examiner considers that the U-shaped lamps 34 and 35 of Van Duijneveldt are not connected in series, one end (electrode) of the U-shaped lamps 34 or 35 is still electrically connected to another end (electrode) of the neighboring lamps 34' or 35' in series. Therefore, the amended claim 12  
15  
20 can be distinguishable from Van Duijneveldt's invention.

As a result, the amended claim 12 shall be patentable over Van Duijneveldt's invention. In addition, claims 13 and 16 are dependent upon the amended claim 12. Claims 13 and 16 shall be allowable if claim 12 is found patentable. Reconsideration of claims 12-13 and 16 is politely requested.

25

2. Rejection of claims 14-15 and 20-22:

Claims 14-15 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Duijneveldt (U.S. Patent No. 5,971,567) in view of Yajima et al, (Pub. No.: US 2001/0050735 A1). Reasons of rejection are cited on page 3-5 of above-mentioned Office Action.

5 **Response:**

Claim 14-15 and 20-22 are dependent upon the amended claim 12, and should be allowable if the amended claim 12 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claim 14-15 and 20-22 is respectfully requested.

10       Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

15

*Winston Hsu*

Date: 02/09/2007

20       e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)